available for public inspection at the Atomic Energy Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20545, and at the Kewaunee Public Library, 314 Milwaukee Street, Kewaunee, Wis.

(b) Those persons submitting a written statement in accordance with paragraph (a) above may request an opportunity to make oral statements, concerning the written statement. Such requests shall accompany the written statement and shall set forth reasons justifying the need for such oral statement and its usefulness to the subcommittee. To the extent that the time available for the meeting permits, the subcommittee will receive oral statements during a period of not more than 30 minutes at an appropriate time, chosen by the Chairman of the Subcommittee, between the hours of 1:30 p.m. and 3:30 p.m. on the day of the meeting.

(c) Requests for the opportunity to make oral statements shall be ruled on by the Chairman of the Subcommittee, who is empowered to apportion the time available among those selected by him to make oral statements.

(d) Information as to whether the meeting has been canceled or rescheduled and in regard to the Chairman's ruling on requests for the opportunity to present oral statements, and the time allotted, can be obtained by a prepaid telephone call on May 18, 1973, to the office of the executive secretary of the Committee (telephone: 301-973-5651) between 8:30 a.m. and 5:15 p.m., e.d.t.

(e) Questions may be propounded only by members of the subcommittee and its consultants.

(f) Seating for the public will be available on a first-come, first-served basis.

(g) Copies of minutes of public sessions will be made available for inspection on or after July 6, 1973, at the Atomic Energy Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. Copies may be obtained upon payment of appropriate charges.

JOHN V. VINCIGUERRA,
*Advisory Committee Management Officer.*

[FR Doc.73-8691 Filed 5-1-73;8:45 am]

---

[Dockets Nos. 50-404 and 50-405]

## VIRGINIA ELECTRIC AND POWER CO.

### Order for Evidentiary Hearing

APRIL 27, 1973.

*It is hereby ordered,* That the initial session of the evidentiary hearing in this proceeding shall convene at 10 a.m. local time on May 7, 1973, in the circuit courtroom, Louisa County Courthouse, Louisa, Va.

All persons who have requested limited appearances will be afforded an opportunity to state their views on the first day of the hearing, or at such other times as the atomic safety and licensing board may for good cause designate.

The following agenda will in general be followed:

1. Disposition of preliminary matters raised by the atomic safety and licensing board;
2. Opening statements of the parties;
3. Statements by persons permitted to make limited appearances;
4. Disposition of preliminary motions of the parties and related matters;
5. Introduction of testimony;
6. Questioning of witnesses by parties and by the atomic safety and licensing Board.
7. Closing matters.

Dated this 27th day of April 1973, at Fredericksburg, Va.

By the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board.

SIDNEY G. KINGSLEY,
*Chairman.*

[FR Doc.73-8692 Filed 5-1-73;8:45 am]

---

# CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

[Docket No. 25137; Order 73-4-102]

## ALLEGHENY AIRLINES, INC.

### Service to Glens Falls, N.Y.; Order Denying Application for Order To Show Cause and Setting Application for Hearing

Adopted by the Civil Aeronautics Board at its office in Washington, D.C., on the 25th day of April 1973.

On January 18, 1973, Allegheny Airlines, Inc. (Allegheny), filed an application to delete Glens Falls, N.Y., as a separate intermediate point on segment 33 of Allegheny's route 97 and to redesignate the points Glens Falls and Albany, N.Y., on segment 33, as Albany-Glens Falls, N.Y. (to be served through the Albany County Airport). In addition, Allegheny filed a petition requesting the Board to issue an order to show cause why its application in docket 25137 should not be granted.[2]

Answers in opposition to Allegheny's application and petition were filed by the New York State Department of Transportation and the County of Warren, N.Y.

In support of its application, Allegheny alleges, inter alia, that Glens Falls has always been a poor traffic generating point in spite of a high level of service, and that termination of service at the Glens Falls airport would provide an economic improvement of approximately $69,000 including the reduction in Allegheny's return and tax requirement.

The New York State Department of Transportation and Warren County argue, inter alia, that the entire Adirondacks area would be adversely affected if the Allegheny's service to the Glens Falls airport is terminated; that the carrier has not provided satisfactory service; that Allegheny should receive subsidy to provide service to Glens Falls; and that a hearing is required to develop a full and complete evidentiary record on the matters raised by Allegheny's application.

Upon consideration of the pleadings and all the relevant facts, we have decided to deny Allegheny's request for a show cause order, and set for hearing Allegheny's application to delete Glens Falls as a separate point and redesignate it as a hyphenated point with Albany. The civic parties oppose the application and we believe that under all the circumstances it is appropriate to consider on an evidentiary record all the matters raised by Allegheny's application.

*Accordingly, it is ordered,* That:

1. The motion of Allegheny Airlines, Inc., for an order to show cause, be and it hereby is denied;

2. The application of Allegheny Airlines, Inc., in docket 25137, be and it hereby is set for hearing at a time and place to be hereafter designated; [3] and

3. A copy of this order shall be served upon Allegheny Airlines, Inc.; the mayors of the cities of Glens Falls and Albany, N.Y.; the County of Warren, N.Y.; Governor, State of New York; the New York State Department of Transportation; the Warren County Airport; and the U.S. Postal Service.

This order will be published in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

By the Civil Aeronautics Board.

[SEAL] EDWIN Z. HOLLAND,
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc.73-8562 Filed 5-1-73;8:45 am]

---

[Docket No. 25402; Order 73-4-100]

## FRONTIER AIRLINES, INC.

### Cancellation of Military Standby Fares in Noncompetitive Markets; Order Dismissing Complaint

Adopted by the Civil Aeronautics Board at its office in Washington, D.C., on the 25th day of April 1973.

By tariff revisions marked to become effective April 29, 1973,[1] Frontier Airlines, Inc. (Frontier) proposes to cancel its military standby fares in all of its noncompetitive markets. Military standby fares will be retained by Frontier in competitive markets and military reservation fares (which reflect a 33⅓-percent discount), will continue to be available throughout Frontier's system.

The Secretary of the Army has filed a complaint on behalf of the U.S. Department of Defense (DOD) requesting its suspension and investigation. The complaint alleges that the proposed cancel-

[2] The authority to serve Glens Falls, on a north-south routing over what is now segment 33 on Allegheny's system (New York/Newark-Albany-Glens Falls-Rutland-Saranac Lake/Lake Puacid-Burlinton-Plattsburgh-Ogdensburg/Massena), was transferred from Eastern Air Lines to Allegheny's predecessor, Mohawk Airlines, in the Eastern-Mohawk Transfer Case, 34 C.A.B. 274 (1961). Mohawk began service at Glens Falls in 1956 on an east-west routing, but the carrier's authority to provide that service was terminated in 1965 in service to Glens Falls, N.Y., 43 C.A.B. 1 (1965).

[3] The hearing shall determine whether the public convenience and necessity require that Allegheny's certificate be altered, amended, or modified so as to (1) suspend or delete Glens Falls, N.Y., and/or (2) redesignate Albany, N.Y., as Albany-Glens Falls, N.Y., with service to be provided through the Albany Airport. As an alternative to amending Allegheny's certificate, we shall place in issue whether the public interest requires the temporary suspension of service by Allegheny, with or without conditions.

[1] Revisions to Airline Tariff Publishers, Inc., agent, CAB No. 136.

lation will create a very real and unjust burden on military personnel; that armed forces personnel do not receive sufficient remuneration to permit them to travel by air at full fares; that because of the time element air travel is often the only mode of transportation suitable for short furloughs; and that military fares provide an excellent public relations and advertising conduit for the airlines and hence generate future full-fare traffic. The complaint further alleges that by allowing Frontier to cancel these fares the Board will, in effect, be encouraging other carriers to make similar proposals.

Upon consideration of the proposal, the complaint and all other relevant matters, the Board finds that the complaint does not set forth sufficient facts to warrant investigation, and the request therefor, and accordingly the request for suspension, will be denied and the complaint dismissed.

Frontier's proposal is not unique to the local service industry since several carriers do not presently offer military standby fares. In view of Frontier's continuing subsidized status and the fact that special reservation fares for the military will continue to be available at a significant discount in markets where Frontier would cancel its military standby fares, we are unable to conclude that its proposal is unreasonable.

Accordingly, pursuant to the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, and particularly sections 204(a), 403, 404, and 1002 thereof,

*It is ordered*, That:

1. The complaint of the Department of Defense in docket 25402 is dismissed; and

2. A copy of this order be served upon Frontier Airlines, Inc., and the Department of Defense.

This order shall be published in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

By the Civil Aeronautics Board.

[SEAL] EDWIN Z. HOLLAND,
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc.73-8563 Filed 5-1-73;8:45 am]

---

[Dockets Nos. 22364, 25474; Order 73-4-117]

## U.S. MAINLAND-HAWAII FARES

### Hawaii Fares Investigation; Order

Adopted by the Civil Aeronautics Board at its office in Washington, D.C., on the 27th day of April 1973.

On March 30, 1973, Pan American World Airways, Inc. (Pan American), filed a petition requesting that the Board revoke order 72-5-100, which prescribes regular fares in the U.S. mainland-Hawaii markets, so as to permit the filing of tariffs increasing fares in the west coast-Hawaii market.

Pan American asserts that it as well as other carriers continue to suffer large losses in Hawaiian service, and that an increase in fares is essential. Pan American states that in 1972 it sustained an operating loss in its west coast-Hawaii service of $5.6 million in spite of a 56.2-percent passenger load factor, and alleges that at current fare levels it anticipates an operating loss for the year ending June 30, 1974, of $10.4 million.

Pan American also contends that the Board's evaluation of the discount-fare situation in order 72-11-31 does not accurately reflect usage of these fares in the west coast-Hawaii markets.[1] It further alleges that the wide use of discount fares from interior markets is both appropriate and reasonable due to the longer hauls involved (and thus the need for lower fares to encourage travel) and the developmental stage of these markets. Pan American alleges that the carriers are faced with a problem of limited traffic growth and market development, and that the continued availability of discount fares is warranted and not a reasonable basis for precluding needed regular fare increases.[2]

Pan American challenges the Board's premise in denying the carriers' request for a regular fare increase last fall (order 72-11-31). In that order, the Board indicated its concern with the discount fare/regular fare relationship in the Hawaiian market, both in terms of the dollar level of discount fares and the proportion of discount-fare traffic to total traffic. It was the Board's belief at that time that the carriers should take those remedial actions within their powers before turning to the Board for basic fare increases. Since issuance of order 72-11-31, most carriers have attempted to effectuate substantive discount-fare revisions but competitive forces have necessitated withdrawal of those proposals.

While Pan American's experience with discount fares may differ somewhat from the data upon which we relied in order 72-11-31, it does not alter our opinion that the growing use of discount fares in recent years has had a significantly debasing effect on fare yield and has contributed to carrier losses. Nevertheless, detailed information on traffic patterns in the mainland-Hawaii market, upon which to base a definitive judgment are not now avaliable, and we conclude that an investigation of the level of discount fares and their relationship to normal fares should now be undertaken.

Several factors lead us to the conclusion that this investigation should also encompass a reexamination of our decision in docket 22364 with respect to normal fare levels. The fares which were prescribed in order 72-5-100 were estimated to produce an overall combined rate of return for Braniff, Continental, Pan American, United, and Western, of 4.2 percent for the forecast year ended June 30, 1971. This return has not been achieved and, in fact, most carriers have been sustaining significant operating the record on which our decision was losses in the intervening years. Further, based reflected little in the way of actual experience under the new market conditions stemming from certification of additional competitive service in 1969. The pattern of competitive services has now been relatively stable for a period of several years and we should be in a better position to evaluate the revenue need in this market.

Moreover, the cost data used to develop the forecast in docket 22364 were based on experienced results for the year ended June 30, 1970. There can be little doubt that costs in this market have followed the general rising trend being sustained in overall domestic operations. In addition, we perceive no reason at this time why normal fare levels in the mainland-Hawaii markets should not be reevaluated in light of the ratemaking principles established in the various phases of the domestic Passenger-Fare Investigation.

In summary, it is our view that the outdated state of economic data upon which the decision in docket 22364 was based, the subsequent establishment of various ratemaking principles in the Domestic Passenger-Fare Investigation and the substantially changed market conditions which have evolved since the case was tried, warrant revocation of the normal fare levels prescribed in order 72-5-100, and institution of an investigation of the level of regular fare and the level and structure of discount fares in the U.S. mainland-Hawaii market.

Aspects of the regular fare structure were extensively litigated in the previous U.S. mainland-Hawaii fares case and there appears to be no need to litigate them again. These issues are the relationship between second- and third-class fares, charges for in-flight amenities, and consideration of regular fares for services between interior U.S. points and Hawaii. These issues will accordingly be excluded from consideration in the investigation ordered herein.[3]

Accordingly, upon consideration of the foregoing, and all other relevant matters,

*It is ordered*, That:

1. That part of order 72-5-100 which prescribes the level of first-, second-, and third-class regular fares in the U.S. mainland-Hawaii market is hereby revoked;

2. Exceptions to the preceding ordering paragraph may be filed and served on or before the 15th day after date of service of this order. Such exceptions

---

[1] The carrier submits that, while the Board relied on an analysis of traffic during the first 6 months of 1972 which showed that 51 percent of coach and economy traffic traveled on discount fares, its own experience during this period indicated that discount-fare travel accounted for only 38 percent of this traffic.

[2] Continental Air Lines, Inc., and Western Air Lines, Inc., have filed answers in support of Pan American's petition. United Air Lines, Inc., has filed an answer which, although supporting the ultimate objective of the petition, requests its denial as unnecessary to achieve the normal tariff filing environment. Hawaiian Airlines, Inc., and Aloha Airlines, Inc., have filed joint comments with respect to the common-fare requirement, and take no position on the issue of fare increases.

[3] Of course, the scope of the proceeding is subject to modification in the light of any petitions for reconsideration which may be filed.

shall set forth specific objections to the revocation, in part, of order 72-5-100 and the grounds in support therefor. If no exceptions are filed within said 15-day period, ordering paragraph 1 shall become final without further order of the Board. If exceptions are filed within said 15-day period, further proceedings in connection therewith shall be conducted in such manner as the Board may deem appropriate;

3. An investigation is instituted to determine whether the level of regular fares, the relationship of first-class fares to second-class fares, and the level and structure of discount fares in the U.S. mainland-Hawaii market and rules, regulations, or practices affecting such fares and provisions are unjust, unreasonable, unjustly discriminatory, unduly preferential, unduly prejudicial or otherwise unlawful, and if found to be unlawful, to determine and prescribe the lawful fares and provisions, and rules, regulations, and practices affecting such fares and provisions;

4. Except to the extent granted herein, the petition of Pan American World Airways filed in docket 22364 is dismissed; and

5. Copies of this order be served upon American Airlines, Inc., Braniff Airways, Inc., Continental Air Lines, Inc., Northwest Airlines, Inc., Pan American World Airways, Inc., Trans World Airlines, Inc., United Air Lines, Inc., and Western Air Lines, Inc., who are hereby made parties to the investigation ordered herein, and upon all parties to docket 22364.

This order will be published in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

By the Civil Aeronautics Board.

[SEAL] EDWIN Z. HOLLAND,
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc.73-8564 Filed 5-1-73;8:45 am]

## COMMISSION ON THE BANKRUPTCY LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

### NOTICE OF MEETINGS

The Commission on the Bankruptcy Laws of the United States will meet between the hours of 10 a.m. and 5 p.m. on May 17, 1973, in the law library of the Rayburn House Office Building and between those same hours on May 18 and 19, in room 2148 of the Rayburn Building. Unresolved questions concerning the proposed chapters on reorganizations, the bankruptcy court, the initiation of proceedings, the allowance and priority of claims, and the collection and liquidation of estates will be considered.

FRANK R. KENNEDY,
*Executive Director.*

[FR Doc.73-8529 Filed 5-1-73;8:45 am]

## COMMITTEE FOR PURCHASE OF PRODUCTS AND SERVICES OF THE BLIND AND OTHER SEVERELY HANDICAPPED

### PROCUREMENT LIST OF 1973

#### Notice of Proposed Deletions

Notice is hereby given pursuant to section 2(a)(2) of Public Law 92-28, 85 Stat. 79, of the proposed deletion of the following commodities from Procurement List 1973, March 12, 1973 (38 FR 6742).

COMMODITIES

CLASS 7920

Broom, Upright:
7920-292-2368
7920-292-2369
7920-292-4370
Brush, Sanitary:
7920-141-5450

Comments and views regarding these proposed deletions may be filed with the Committee on or before May 31, 1973. Communications should be addressed to the Executive Director, Committee for Purchase of Products and Services of the Blind and Other Severely Handicapped, 2009 14th Street North, Suite 610, Arlington, Va. 22201.

By the Committee.

CHARLES W. FLETCHER,
*Executive Director.*

[FR Doc.73-8688 Filed 5-1-73;8:45 am]

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

### PROTECTION OF NATION'S WETLANDS

#### Policy Statement

*Purpose.*—The purpose of this statement is to establish EPA policy to preserve the wetland ecosystems and to protect them from destruction through waste water or nonpoint source discharges and their treatment or control or the development and construction of waste water treatment facilities or by other physical, chemical, or biological means.

*The wetland resource.*—a. Wetlands represent an ecosystem of unique and major importance to the citizens of this Nation and, as a result, they require extraordinary protection. Comparable destructive forces would be expected to inflict more lasting damage to them than to other ecosystems. Through this policy statement, EPA establishes appropriate safeguards for the preservation and protection of the wetland resources.

b. The Nation's wetlands, including marshes, swamps, bogs, and other lowlying areas, which during some period of the year will be covered in part by natural nonflood waters, are a unique, valuable, irreplaceable water resource. They serve as a habitat for important furbearing mammals, many species of fish, and waterfowl. Such areas moderate extremes in waterflow, aid in the natural purification of water, and maintain and recharge the ground water resource. They are the nursery areas for a great number of wildlife and aquatic species and serve at times as the source of valuable harvestable timber. They are unique recreational areas, high in aesthetic value, that contain delicate and irreplaceable specimens of fauna and flora and support fishing, as well as wildfowl and other hunting.

c. Fresh-water wetlands support the adjacent or downstream aquatic ecosystem in addition to the complex web of life that has developed within the wetland environment. The relationship of the fresh-water wetland to the subsurface environment is symbiotic, intricate, and fragile. In the tidal wetland areas the tides tend to redistribute the nutrients and sediments throughout the tidal marsh and these in turn form a substrate for the life supported by the tidal marsh. These marshes produce large quantities of plant life that are the source of much of the organic matter consumed by shellfish and other aquatic life in associated estuaries.

d. Protection of wetland areas requires the proper placement and management of any construction activities and controls of nonpoint sources to prevent disturbing significantly the terrain and impairing the quality of the wetland area. Alteration in quantity or quality of the natural flow of water, which nourishes the ecosystem, should be minimized. The addition of harmful waste waters or nutrients contained in such waters should be kept below a level that will alter the natural, physical, chemical, or biological integrity of the wetland area and that will insure no significant increase in nuisance organisms through biostimulation.

*Policy.*—a. In its decision processes, it shall be the Agency's policy to give particular cognizance and consideration to any proposal that has the potential to damage wetlands, to recognize the irreplaceable value and man's dependence on them to maintain an environment acceptable to society, and to preserve and protect them from damaging misuses.

b. It shall be the Agency's policy to minimize alterations in the quantity or quality of the natural flow of water that nourishes wetlands and to protect wetlands from adverse dredging or filling practices, solid waste management practices, siltation or the addition of pesticides, salts, or toxic materials arising from nonpoint source wastes and through construction activities, and to prevent

violation of applicable water quality standards from such environmental insults.

c. In compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, it shall be the policy of this Agency not to grant Federal funds for the construction of municipal waste water treatment facilities or other waste-treatment-associated appurtenances which may interfere with the existing wetland ecosystem, except where no other alternative of lesser environmental damage is found to be feasible. In the application for such Federal funds where there is reason to believe that wetlands will be damaged, an assessment will be requested from the applicant that delineates the various alternatives that have been investigated for the control or treatment of the waste water, including the reasons for rejecting those alternatives not used. A cost-benefit appraisal should be included where appropriate.

d. To promote the most environmentally protective measures, it shall be the EPA policy to advise those applicants who install waste treatment facilities under a Federal grant program or as a result of a Federal permit that the selection of the most environmentally protective alternative should be made. The Department of the Interior and the Department of Commerce will be consulted to aid in the determination of the probable impact of the pollution abatement program on the pertinent fish and wildlife resources of wetlands. In the event of projected significant adverse environmental impact, a public hearing on the wetlands issue may be held to aid in the selection of the most appropriate action, and EPA may recommend against the issuance of a section 10 Corps of Engineers permit.

*Implementation.*—EPA will apply this policy to the extent of its authorities in conducting all program activities, including regulatory activities, research, development and demonstration, technical assistance, control of pollution from Federal institutions, and the administration of the construction and demonstration grants, State program grants, and planning grants programs.

WILLIAM D. RUCKELSHAUS,
*Administrator.*

MARCH 20, 1973.

[FR Doc.73-8579 Filed 5-1-73;8:45 am]

## FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

[Docket No. CP73-280]

### NATURAL GAS PIPELINE CO. OF AMERICA

#### Notice of Application

APRIL 25, 1973.

Take notice that on April 17, 1973, Natural Gas Pipeline Co. of America (Applicant), 122 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60603, filed in docket No. CP73-280 an application pursuant to section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act for a certificate of public convenience and necessity authorizing Applicant to continue sales of natural gas in interstate commerce to Arkansas Louisiana Gas Co. and H. L. Hunt, et al., from the North Lansing Field, Harrison County, Tex., heretofore made by small producer certificate holders, all as more fully set forth in the application which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Applicant proposes to continue the following sales:

| Small producer | Certificate docket No. | Price (cents per M ft³ at 14.65 lb/in²a) | Buyer |
|---|---|---|---|
| Bert Fields, Jr. | CS66-122 | 13.4924 | Arkansas Louisiana Gas Co. |
| Bert Fields, Jr. | CS66-122 | 16.7835 | H. L. Hunt et al. |
| David A. Wilson. | CS72-416 | 20.1 | Arkansas Louisiana Gas Co. |
| Gladstone Gasoline Co. | CS71-832 | 20.1 | Do. |
| Kewanee Oil Co. | CS66-12 | 13.4924 | Do. |
| Do. | CS66-12 | 20.1 | Do. |
| Elizabeth F. Dorfman trust. | CS72-406 | 20.1 | Do. |
| Mrs. D. W. Neustadt. | CS72-838 | 20.1 | Do. |
| Grady H. Vaughn III et al. | CS66-14<br>CS71-875 | 16.7835 | H. L. Hunt et al. |
| Lechner & Hubbard. | CS71-392 | 16.7835 | Do. |

Applicant states that it is willing to accept authorization to continue sales at the area rates where the contract rates are in excess of the area rates.

Any person desiring to be heard or to make any protest with reference to said application should on or before May 15, 1973, file with the Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C. 20426, a petition to intervene or a protest in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's rules of practice and procedure (18 CFR 1.8 or 1.10) and the regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.10). All protests filed with the Commission will be considered by it in determining the appropriate action to be taken but will not serve to make the protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party to a proceeding or to participate as a party in any hearing therein must file a petition to intervene in accordance with the Commission's rules.

Take further notice that, pursuant to the authority contained in and subject to the jurisdiction conferred upon the Federal Power Commission by sections 7 and 15 of the Natural Gas Act and the Commission's rules of practice and procedure, a hearing will be held without further notice before the Commission on this application if no petition to intervene is filed within the time required herein, if the Commission on its own review of the matter finds that a grant of the certificate is required by the public convenience and necessity. If a petition for leave to intervene is timely filed, or if the Commission on its own motion believes that a formal hearing is required, further notice of such hearing will be duly given.

Under the procedure herein provided for, unless otherwise advised, it will be unnecessary for Applicant to appear or be represented at the hearing.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc.73-8398 Filed 4-30-73;8:45 am]

[Docket No. CP72-233]

### NATURAL GAS PIPELINE CO. OF AMERICA; SABINE PASS PROJECT

#### Notice of Availability of Final Environmental Impact Statement

MAY 1, 1973.

Notice is hereby given in the captioned docket that on May 1, 1973, as required by § 2.82(b) of Commission Order No. 415–C, a final environmental statement prepared by the staff of the Federal Power Commission, was made available. This statement deals with the environmental impact in the proceeding under docket No. CP72–233, Natural Gas Pipeline Co. of America for certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act for construction of approximately 27 miles of 16-inch pipeline, a side tap connection on an existing natural gas transmission pipeline of the applicant in the area, measurement facilities and miscellaneous appurtenant facilities, including a liquid removal facility. All construction would occur in the Sabine Pass area of Texas, near Port Arthur, Tex.

This statement has been sent to the Council on Environmental Quality and to Federal, State, and local agencies, has been placed in the public files of the Commission's Office of Public Information, room 2523, General Accounting Office Building, 441 G Street NW., Washington, D.C., and at its regional office located at 819 Taylor Street, Fort Worth, Tex. Copies may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Department of Commerce, Springfield, Va. 22151.

A staff draft environmental impact statement was circulated for comments on March 27, 1973. The Commission found that it was necessary and appropriate in the public interest to dispense with the 45-day-time period for review and comment and shortened the period to 30 days to afford the Commission the opportunity to decide in as expeditious manner as possible if the merits of this application serve the public convenience and necessity.

The 30-day period for comment expired on April 26, 1973. All comments received are attached to the final environmental impact statement in accordance with § 2.82(b) of Commission Order No. 415–C.

KENNETH F. PLUMB,
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc.73-8641 Filed 5-1-73;8:45 am]

## FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

### FIRST FINANCIAL CORP.

#### Acquisition of Bank

First Financial Corp., Tampa, Fla., has applied for the Board's approval under